

Brush, Jason

From: Brush, Jason
Sent: Friday, November 22, 2013 2:49 PM
To: Sumner, Rich
Subject: FW: Rep. Grijalva highlights EPA finding that Rosemont should not receive CWA permit
Categories: EPA

From: Brush, Jason
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 6:24 PM
To: Diamond, Jane; Ryerson, Teddy
Cc: Evans, David; Pendergast, Jim; Miller, Clay; Kaiser, Russell; Fertik, Rachel; Kermish, Laurie; Campbell, Rich; Bose, Laura
Subject: Rep. Grijalva highlights EPA finding that Rosemont should not receive CWA permit
May partially explain McCain staffer's inquiry to R9 OPA today... -JB
<http://grijalva.house.gov/news-and-press-releases/grijalva-highlights-epa-finding-that-rosemont-mine-should-not-receive-water-permit-due-to-likely-clean-water-act-violations/#.Uo6ZERZq9K0.email>

Grijalva Highlights EPA Finding That Rosemont Mine Should Not Receive Water Permit Due to Likely Clean Water Act Violations

Thursday November 21, 2013

Washington, D.C. – Rep. Raúl M. Grijalva today highlighted the recent Environmental Protection Agency finding that the proposed Rosemont Mine should not be given a Clean Water Act permit to operate in the Santa Rita Mountains near Tucson. Grijalva has publicly agreed with Save the Scenic Santa Ritas, a local advocacy group, that not enough scientific analysis has been done to justify building the mine.

Save the Scenic Santa Ritas in a Nov. 20 press release publicized [a letter from the EPA](#) to the Army Corps of Engineers, dated Nov. 7, in which the agency declares that “degradation [from the mine] would be a substantial and unacceptable impact to aquatic resources of national importance, including the ‘Outstanding Waters’ of Davidson Canyon and Cienega Creek.” The EPA recommends the Army Corps not issue the Clean Water Act permit that Rosemont’s parent company, Augusta Resource, needs to operate the mine.

“I’ve said all along, and I’m not alone, that good science should be more important in this decision than slick marketing brochures and political spin,” Grijalva said. “Augusta Resource tried to manipulate elections, gin up a phony local support campaign, and paper over serious environmental risks with a big advertising budget. Thankfully the EPA has done the hard and thorough research Augusta has tried to prevent, and the results are as clear as it gets. This mine would be an ecological disaster and violate the Clean Water Act. If Augusta has better data, let’s see it.”

As the *Tucson Weekly* [reported](#) last year in a feature on the history of the proposed mining site:

Not only was [Augusta] touting a ‘21st century mine,’ but it also fueled a cutting-edge spin campaign, with at least two local public-relations firms on its payroll at any given time. It regularly bought sponsorships on the local public-broadcasting station, and inundated Tucson’s business community with the message that this mine would prove a perfect antidote to hard times. Augusta went so far as to fashion a surreal logo with a pigtailed little girl gazing toward the sky. . . . Later, the company began targeting areas of town with letters seemingly signed by neighbors who supported the mine. The effort suffered a setback, though, when it turned out that the letters had actually been written by Augusta’s in-house PR crew.

“The EPA has done the most careful, substantive and meaningful scientific analysis to date of the mine’s potential impacts,” Grijalva said. “This should be the standard as this process moves forward. From now on, science is going to trump spin and substance is going to trump salesmanship. If Augusta wants to move forward on that basis, let’s get started. Otherwise Southern Arizona needs to move on to better economic ideas.”